

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,582	02/04/2004	Phil Patterson	B00-018D	3804
26683 75	590 05/17/2005		EXAM	INER
THE GATES	CORPORATION		YAO, SAMC	HUAN CUA
IP LAW DEPT	. 10-A3			
1551 WEWAT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DENVER, CO	80202		1733	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ı
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/771,582	PATTERSON ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sam Chuan C. Yao	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above, the maximum statute is NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recation.  ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of third by period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON, by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	2/4/11		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 16 <del>May 200</del> 5.		
	☐ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for	•	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice	•	• •	
Disposition of Claims		·	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the appli	cation		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		ov the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objectio	• • •		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • •	).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by		• •	<b>,</b> ;
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreign priority under 35 H S C &	119(a)-(d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	rereign priority under 55 0,5,0, §	1 1 v(a)-(u) or (1).	
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.		
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority do		oplication No.	
3. Copies of the certified copies of t			
application from the International	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for	` ''	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	.948) Paper No(s	)/Mail Date	
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02-04-04</u>.</li> </ol>	D/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice of In 6) ☐ Other:	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
. 40. 115(5).116.1 Dato <u>02-07-07</u> .		_·	

Application/Control Number: 10/771,582

Art Unit: 1733

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112.

 Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This claim is indefinite, because the phrase "the step of venting gases ..." does not have a positive antecedent basis. Is the venting step in this claim referring to the evacuation step in claim 1? For the purpose of examining this claim, it is assumed that the venting step is different from the evacuation step.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1-2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 4,106,966) in view of Rosenboom et al (US 6,464,607), Noto (US 5,925,297) and Fix (US 3,656,360).

Brooks discloses a process of making power transmission belts, the process comprises wrapping a 1<sup>st</sup> polymeric material (58) onto a building drum (60); spirally winding tensile cords (24) onto the 1<sup>st</sup> polymeric material; wrapping a 2<sup>nd</sup> polymeric material (62) onto the tensile cord layer to form a belt sleeve (57); placing a jacket over the belt sleeve; placing them to a curing device (65); introducing a 1<sup>st</sup> pressurized steam

Art Unit: 1733

within the drum; introducing 2<sup>nd</sup> pressurized steam between the outside surface of the jacket and curing device; curing the belt sleeve; cooling drum/sleeve/jacket by submerging them into a coolant; separating the drum and the jacket from the belt sleeve; and then cutting the belt sleeve into a plurality of transmission belts (col. 3 line 7 to col. 6 line 56). Although not explicitly disclosed, the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> polymeric materials are reasonably expected to be derived from an elastomeric material as evidence from the following passage: "... curing is used as a broad term which is intended to cover vulcanization of rubber compounds used in making the belt defining sleeve 57." (col. 6 lines 52-56). In any event, such would have been obvious in the art as such is a notoriously common practice in the art as exemplified in the teachings of Rosenboom et al. Moreover, it would have been imperative to reduce the pressure within the drum and the pressure between the jacket and curing device to an ambient pressure before the drum/sleeve/jacket is removed from the curing device by venting the 1st and 2nd pressurized steams to a collection station to prevent anyone from being hurt pressurized steam. While Brooks teaches optionally providing a belt sleeve with fabric layers and reinforcing materials depending on the desired characteristics of a finished belt (col. 6 line 65 to col. 7 line 3), Brooks does not explicitly suggest providing a nonwoven web to a 2<sup>nd</sup> elastomeric layer. However, it would have been obvious in the art to provide a non-woven web to a 2<sup>nd</sup> elastomeric layer in a process taught by Brooks, because it is well known in the art to provide a nonwoven web facing layer to a ribs section of a belt as exemplified in the teachings of Rosenboom et al (col. 2 lines 19-38).

Application/Control Number: 10/771,582

Art Unit: 1733

Rosenboom et al does not teach evacuating air within curing device after the drum/sleeve/jacket is placed the curing device. However, it is a notoriously common practice in the art to evacuate air in a molding device after layers to be molded together are placed the molding device to remove air pockets that may be trapped between the layers as exemplified in the teachings of Noto (col. 2 lines 17-28). Fix is cited to as further evidence it is known in the art to apply vacuum to a mold before and during a molding operation (col. 2 lines 33-56; example 1).

With respect to claim 2, one in the art would have determined, by routine experimentation, an evacuation time which is needed to ensure that substantially all air packets between layers are removed. Absent any showing of unexpected benefit, such is taken to be a result effective variable.

With respect to claim 6, to prevent noxious gases generated during a curing operation from substantially escaping to the environment, it would have been obvious in the art to vent the gases to a gas collection station for disposal or incineration. Since a non-woven web is air pervious, it would be natural to vent generated gases through a nonwoven web portion of a belt sleeve.

4. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 4,106,966) in view of Resenboom et al (US 6,464,607) as applied to claim 2 and further in view of Nagata et al (US 6,739,854).

Brooks is silent on the operating pressure and operating time for curing a belt sleeve. In particular, Brooks does not teach exerting a steam pressure of 175-235 psig outside a

Application/Control Number: 10/771,582

Art Unit: 1733

mold shell (claim 3), steam pressure of 85-210 psig for 2-10 minutes inside a mold (claim 4), and curing time of 10-20 minutes (claim 5).

However, as noted by Nagata et al, drawn to making transmission belt, "[t]he exact conditions for vulcanization are not critical, as those skilled in the art are familiar with all critical parameters." (col. 6 lines 13-41). Absent any showing of unexpected benefit, the recited operating conditions in these claims are taken to be result effective variables, routinely optimized by those versed in the art. For these reasons, these claims would have been obvious in the art making transmission belt using a process taught by Brooks.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks (US 4,106,966) in view of Rosenboom et al (US 6,464,607) and Fix (US 3,656,360).
The discussion of the Brooks and Rosenboom et al patents set forth in numbered paragraph 4 is incorporated herein.

As for a limitation of venting gases, such would have been obvious in the art, because it is old in the art to apply suction pressure during a heat-molding operation to remove gases from a mold. To prevent noxious gases generated during a curing operation from substantially escaping to the environment, it would have been obvious in the art to vent the gases to a gas collection station for disposal or incineration. Since a non-woven web is air pervious, it would be natural to vent generated gases through a nonwoven web portion of a belt sleeve.

Art Unit: 1733

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Chuan C. Yao whose telephone number is (571) 272-1224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with second Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on (571) 272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam Chuan C. Yao Primary Examiner Art Unit 1733

Scy 05-16-05